

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI
SOUTHERN DIVISION**

NORMA ROGERS, ARTHUR ROGERS,
WILLIAM HALE,

Plaintiffs,

v.

DOUGLAS D GASTON, IN HIS
INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL
CAPACITIES; JANE DOE 1-3, JOHN
DOE 1-3, BOBBY DUNCAN,

Defendants.

Case No. 6:19-03346-CV-RK

ORDER

Before the Court is Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time to submit a joint proposed scheduling order. (Doc. 52.) The motion is fully briefed. (Doc. 52, 53, 56.) After careful consideration, the motion is **GRANTED**.

The parties submitted a joint proposed scheduling order on April 1, 2020. (Doc. 15.) However, no scheduling order has yet been entered in the case. The Court finds an extension is warranted for several reasons. First, the parties appear to have substantially abided by the proposed scheduling order, though it was never entered.¹ Second, little prejudice, if any will be imposed on Defendants. Judge Gaston proposes dispositive motions be due within 30 days. While an extension will push the deadline for dispositive motions past the 30 days suggested, Judge Gaston can file a dispositive motion at any time. Finally, had a scheduling order been entered, the Court would now find good cause for an extension of the deadlines.

Therefore, Plaintiffs' motion for an extension of time to submit a proposed scheduling order will be due November 6, 2020.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Roseann A. Ketchmark
ROSEANN A. KETCHMARK, JUDGE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

DATED: October 29, 2020

¹ While some of the deadlines in the original proposed scheduling order have now past, the Court still finds an extension is warranted.